

Martin R. Lueck (admitted *pro hac vice*)

MRLueck@rkmc.com

Emmett J. McMahon (admitted *pro hac vice*)

EJMcMahon@rkmc.com

Jamie R. Kurtz (admitted *pro hac vice*)

JRKurtz@rkmc.com

Kristine A. Tietz (admitted *pro hac vice*)

KATietz@rkmc.com

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.

800 LaSalle Avenue

2800 LaSalle Plaza

Minneapolis, MN 55402-2015

Telephone: (612) 349-8500

Facsimile: (612) 349-4181

Larry R. Laycock (UT Bar No. 4868)

LLaycock@mabr.com

Jared J. Braithwaite (UT Bar No. 12455)

JBraithwaite@mabr.com

MASCHOFF BRENNAN LAYCOCK

GILMORE ISRAELSEN & WRIGHT

201 South Main Street, Suite 600

Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Telephone: (435) 252-1360

Facsimile: (435) 252-1361

Matthew B. McFarlane (admitted *pro hac vice*)

MBMcFarlane@rkmc.com

ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.

601 Lexington Ave., 34th Floor

New York, NY 10022

Telephone: (212) 980-7400

Facsimile: (212) 980-7499

*Attorneys for Defendants Quest Diagnostics Incorporated
& Quest Diagnostics Nichols Institute*

[Additional Counsel for Defendants listed on last page]

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION**

**IN RE: BRCA1- AND BRCA2-BASED
HEREDITARY CANCER TEST PATENT
LITIGATION**

MDL CASE No. 2:14-MD-2510 RJS

District Judge Robert J. Shelby

Magistrate Judge Dustin B. Pead

**DEFENDANTS' SHORT FORM MOTION TO COMPEL PRODUCTION OF A 30(b)(6)
WITNESS TO TESTIFY REGARDING TOPIC NOS. 93-98**

Defendants seek testimony on 30(b)(6) topics related to positions taken by Myriad in prior litigations involving the patents and technology at issue in this case. ([Ex. A](#); Topic Nos. 93-98).

The Court has already stated that Myriad's prior positions are pertinent to this litigation. [Dkt. No.](#)

55, fn. 4. During those litigations, Myriad took positions regarding the patented technology and other issues that are relevant to this litigation. For example, the CEO of Myriad testified during his deposition that he believed that Myriad had taken positions regarding available non-infringing alternatives during the *AMP* litigation. (Ex. B). Myriad, however, refuses to designate a witness to testify regarding the prior litigations. Instead, Myriad argues that (1) the information sought is privileged, (2) seeks information regarding Myriad's contentions, and (3) is publicly available. (Ex. C)

As an initial matter, Myriad does not dispute that the testimony sought by Defendants in response to these topics is relevant. There is no doubt that it is—positions taken relating to the same or similar technologies are highly relevant and constitute party admissions. These may include admissions regarding the strength of various patents, non-infringing alternatives, etc. There is no doubt that this information falls within the broad scope of Rule 26.

Myriad's objections are baseless. First, Defendants are not asking for privileged information but merely seeking testimony regarding the ultimate positions that Myriad previously took and the underlying factual bases for those positions. To the extent Myriad believes that Defendants' questions implicate privilege, Myriad is welcome to instruct the witness not to answer and the parties can determine what to do from there.

Second, Myriad's attempt to avoid offering responsive corporate testimony, by arguing that the topics necessarily implicate contentions, is without merit. Just because the positions taken were in litigation does not mean that they were contentions. Even if they were contentions in the prior litigation, they are now facts. At a minimum, Defendants are entitled to know the underlying facts that formed the bases for those contentions.

Finally, Myriad's argument that the requested testimony is publicly available also fails. Myriad's prior discovery responses and deposition transcripts are not publicly available and cannot be found on any Court docket. Further, Myriad has refused to produce such information in this case. As such, Myriad is trying to hamstring Defendants from discovering information regarding prior positions taken by Myriad that are highly likely to be directly relevant to issues in this case. Myriad should not be allowed to hide behind baseless objections to preclude Defendants from discovering this information. There can be no doubt that Myriad is in the best position to provide this highly relevant discovery.

Defendants accordingly request that the Court hear oral argument on these crucial matters and compel Myriad to produce a 30(b)(6) witness on these topics. Defendants certify that the parties made reasonable efforts to reach agreement on the disputed matters during a telephonic conference on October 20, 2014 at 2:30 p.m. in which counsel for all plaintiffs and all defendants participated.

Dated: October 23, 2014

By: /s/ Jared J. Braithwaite

Larry R. Laycock
Jared J. Braithwaite
MASCHOFF BRENNAN LAYCOCK GILMORE
ISRAELSEN & WRIGHT

Martin R. Lueck
Emmett J. McMahon
Matthew B. McFarlane
Jamie R. Kurtz
Kristine A. Tietz
ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.

*Attorneys for Defendants
Quest Diagnostics Incorporated and
Quest Diagnostics Nichols Institute*

Dated: October 23, 2014

By: /s/ William G. Gaede, III

William G. Gaede, III
Eric Hagen
McDermott Will & Emery
275 Middlefield Road, Suite 100
Menlo Park, CA 94025
wgaede@mwe.com
ehagen@mwe.com

Edgar Cataxinos
Trask Britt
230 S 500 E # 300
Salt Lake City, UT 84102
ercataxinos@traskbritt.com

Attorneys for Defendant Ambry Genetics, Inc.

Dated: October 23, 2014

By: /s/ Colin T. Kemp

Robert S. Clark
Rita M. Cornish
Parr Brown Gee & Loveless
185 South State Street, Suite 800
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
rclark@parrbrown.com
rcornish@parrbrown.com

Kirke M. Hasson
Colin T. Kemp
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, 22nd Floor
Post Office Box 2824
San Francisco, CA 94126-2824
kirke.hasson@pillsburylaw.com
colin.kemp@pillsburylaw.com

Richard L. Blaylock
Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP
12255 El Camino Real, Ste. 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Tel. 858.847.4110
Richard.blaylock@pillsburylaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Invitae Corporation

Dated: October 23, 2014

By: /s/ Matias Ferrario

Nathan D. Thomas
Elizabeth M. Butler
JONES WALDO HOLBROOK &
MCDONOUGH, PC
170 S. Main Street, Suite 1500
Salt Lake City, UT 84101-1644
nthomas@joneswaldo.com
ebutler@joneswaldo.com

Matias Ferrario
Leslie T. Grab
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND &
STOCKTON LLP
1001 West Fourth Street
Winston-Salem, NC 27104
mferrario@kilpatricktownsend.com
lgrab@kilpatricktownsend.com

Susan A. Cahoon
KILPATRICK TOWNSEND &
STOCKTON LLP
Suite 2800
1100 Peachtree Street NE
Atlanta, GA 30309

*Attorneys for Defendant Laboratory Corporation of
America Holdings*

Dated: October 23, 2014

By: /s/ Jess M. Krannich
Jess M. Krannich
MANNING CURTIS BRADSHAW
& BEDNAR LLC
136 East South Temple, Suite 1300
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
jkrannich@mc2b.com

Daralyn J. Durie
Mark A. Lemley
DURIE TANGRI LLP
217 Leidesdorff Street
San Francisco, CA 94111
ddurie@durietangri.com
mlemley@durietangri.com

Nicholas Groombridge
Kira A. Davis
PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND,
WHARTON & GARRISON LLP
1285 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10019-6064
ngroombridge@paulweiss.com
kdavis@paulweiss.com

Attorneys for Defendant Counsyl, Inc.

Dated: October 23, 2014

By: /s/ Paul Tripodi
Paul D. Tripodi, II
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
633 West 5th Street, Suite 1550
Los Angeles, CA 90071
brca@wsgr.com

Mark Bettilyon
RAY QUINNEY & NEBEKER
36 South State Street, Suite 1400
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
mbettilyon@rqn.com

Lesli Gallagher
PATHWAY GENOMICS CORP.
4755 Nexus Center Dr.
San Diego, CA 92121
lesli.gallagher@pathway.com

Attorneys for Pathway Genomics

Dated: October 23, 2014

By: /s/ Jeremiah B. Frueauf

Charles L. Roberts
Wasatch-IP
2825 East Cottonwood Pkwy, Ste.
500
Salt Lake City, UT 84121
croberts@wasatch-ip.com

Hemant K. Sabharwal
Jeremiah B. Frueauf
Jorge A. Goldstein
Nirav N. Desai
Sterne Kessler Goldstein & Fox,
PLLC
1100 New York Ave NW
Washington, DC 20005
keetos@skgf.com
jfrueauf@skgf.com
jgold@skgf.com
ndesai@skgf.com

Attorneys for Defendant GeneDx

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On this 23rd day of October 2014, I certify that I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system that will send an electronic notification to counsel of record herein:

Dated: October 23, 2014

/s/ Jared J. Braithwaite
Jared J. Braithwaite